Beyond universality: parametrizing ultracold complex-mediated reactions using statistical assumptions.

Manuel Lara*,[1] P. G. Jambrina,[2] J.-M. Launay,[3] and F. J. Aoiz†[2]

[1] *Departamento de Química Física Aplicada, Facultad de Ciencias, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, 28049 Madrid, Spain*

[2] *Departamento de Química Física, Facultad de Química, Universidad Complutense, 28040 Madrid, Spain*

[3] *Institut de Physique de Rennes, UMR CNRS 6251, Université de Rennes I, F-35042 Rennes, France*

(Dated: November 12, 2014)

We have calculated accurate quantum reactive and elastic cross-sections for the prototypical barrierless reaction $D^+ + H_2(v{=}0, j{=}0)$ using the hyperspherical scattering method. The considered kinetic energy ranges from the ultracold to the Langevin regimes. The availability of accurate results for this system allows to test the quantum theory by Jachymski *et al.* [*Phys. Rev. Lett.* **110**, 213202 (2013)] in a nonuniversal case. The short range reaction probability is rationalized using statistical model assumptions and related to a statistical factor. This provides a means to estimate one of the parameters that characterizes ultracold processes from first principles. Possible limitations of the statistical model are considered.

PACS numbers:

arXiv:1411.2666v1 [physics.chem-ph] 10 Nov 2014

The increasing availability of cold and ultracold samples of atoms and molecules has sprung a great interest in chemical reactions at very low temperatures [1–5]. Although new experimental approaches [5] appear highly promising, advances in the field are hampered by technical problems to produce most molecules at low temperatures and high enough densities. In contrast to neutral species, ions can be easily trapped and cooled. The technology of Coulomb crystals in radio frequency ion traps [6], and the possibility of combining them with traps for neutrals or with slow molecular beams [7, 8], anticipate a great progress in the analysis of ion-neutral reactions in the nearly future.

Theoretical simulations employing standard *ab initio* approaches are not feasible for most of the systems thus far considered. For heavy systems (more convenient experimentally) there are not potential energy surfaces (PES) accurate enough to describe processes near thresholds. Additionally, most of exact dynamical treatments face insurmountable problems in such regime. However, in contrast to short-range (SR) chemical interactions, those occurring at long-range (LR) can be more easily calculated. Moreover, theoretical approaches based on the only knowledge of the LR part of the PES have been able to describe recent experimental findings nearly quantitatively [1, 9]. Indeed, processes at very low collision energies privilege LR interactions, leading to the idea of *universality* in extreme cases [10]: the result of the collision depends exclusively on the LR behavior and not on the details of the PES. In this regard, recently proposed LR parametrization procedures [9, 11–13] are very appealing. Using experimental data, these models are able to predict non-measured values providing some insight into the underlying interactions. In particular, the approach in based on multichannel quantum-defect theory (MQDT), provides analytical expressions which can be easily compared with experimental data [9, 14, 15]. The model has been recently applied to a variety of systems [9, 16, 17]. In particular, for the Penning ionization of Ar by He(^{3}S) [5], the rate coefficients have been fitted in a wide range of collision energies using only two parameters [9]. However, the parameters of the model are phenomenological and they had not been determined before from first principles.

In this work, we present accurate calculations for the reactive collision $D^+ + H_2(v{=}0, j{=}0)$ using the hyperspherical reactive scattering method [18]. We consider collision energies which range from the ultracold regime, where only one partial wave is open, to the Langevin regime where many of them contribute. These calculations allow to test the quantum model by Jachymsky *et al.* [9, 14] by comparison with accurate theoretical results in a realistic atom+diatom system, providing a way to estimate one of the parameters using statistical model assumptions.

The H^++H_2 system (and isotopic variants) is the prototype of ion-molecule reactions, which are usually nearly barrierless and exhibit large cross sections due to their LR, $\propto -C_n/R^n$, n=4, potentials. The process occurs via the strongly bound intermediate H_3^+, the most abundant triatomic ionic species in dense interstellar clouds [19]. At energies below $\approx$ 1.7 eV, the proton exchange is the only reactive channel, and the process can be described on the ground adiabatic PES [20–23]. Since the PES is characterized by a deep well ($\approx$ 4.5 eV), as illustrated in Fig. 1, rigorous statistical models [24, 25] have been applied to this reaction in the low and thermal energy regimes [21, 25–28] in good agreement with accurate calculations. Specifically, the D^++H_2→ H^+ + HD reaction

*Corresponding author. E-mail: *manuel.lara@uam.es*

†Corresponding author. E-mail: *aoiz@quim.ucm.es*

features a small exoergicity (difference of zero point energies). Experiments to determine state specific rate coefficients at energies as low as 12 K [29] have been carried out, and lower temperatures are expected to be feasible soon [30].

The deep ultracold regime, governed by Wigner laws [31], is described in terms of the scattering length. The latter largely varies with slight changes of the interaction potential whenever a bound state occurs in the vicinity of the threshold. Only for very particular atoms [32–34], it has been possible to determine theoretically the experimental scattering length, so we cannot expect *ab initio* methodology to have predictive power at ultracold energies in this atom+diatom system. In the spirit of the work by Gribakin *et al.* [35], we can consider our study as an effort to determine a "characteristic" scattering length. Besides, assuming that the interaction of the system is reasonably described by the current PES, we can use our results to test recent methodologies, like the approach in Refs. [9, 14].

In the (ultra-)cold regime both accurate descriptions of the LR interactions and dynamical propagations up to very large distances are strict requirements. The PES by Velilla *et al.* [36], which includes the LR interactions in the functional form, satisfies the first requirement. The dominant contributions involve the charge-quadrupole , $\propto -R^{-3}$, and the charge-induced dipole, $\propto -R^{-4}$, interactions. However, only the latter contributes to collisions in $j = 0$ [47]. The second requirement is fully satisfied by the hyperspherical quantum reactive scattering method developed by Launay *et al.* [18, 37], recently modified in order to allow the accurate inclusion of LR interactions [38, 39]. These modifications are used here for the first time in order to converge scattering results at ultracold energies in a system where the $\propto -R^{-4}$ behavior implies propagations up to hundreds of thousands of a.u. The logarithmic derivative (LD) in hypersperical coordinates is propagated in the SR region up to a particular value of the hyper-radius and matched to a set of LR functions. As the kinetic energy in the SR region is very large ($\sim$ eV), the LD is almost constant for changes in the collision energy on the order of mK. We can calculate the LD for a few energies, and use interpolations to obtain it for the rest, thus reducing the computational cost[40]

The reaction cross-section in the 10^{-7}–150 K energy range is plotted in Fig. 2 and compared with the Langevin model (LM) expression for the cross-section, $\sigma_{\rm L}(E) = 2\pi(C_4/E)^{1/2}$. The LM is commonly used to rationalize collisions in the regime where many partial waves are open. We have determined the value C_4=2.71 a.u. using the effective potential as a function of R which results from averaging the PES $V(R, r, \theta)$ over r and θ Jacobi coordinates, with the (v=0, j=0) probability distribution. Since the reaction is mediated by a long-lived complex, the collision process can be split in the step of the complex formation (capture), and that of its decomposition. Under this assumption, the LM implies that, once the centrifugal barrier is overcome, the system is captured



FIG. 1: Sketch of the intrinsic reaction path and the rovibrational states involved in the reaction at the studied energies. $A(E)$ and $B(E)$ are the number of incoming and outgoing channels, respectively (1 and 3 for J=0).

in the complex which subsequently decomposes into the H^++HD arrangement channel with unit probability. The LM regime can be associated with the high energy part of the plot, with 5 and 17 partial waves open at 1 K and 150 K, respectively. The calculated cross-sections are found smaller than the LM prediction in this energy range. This comes to no surprise; actually, only a fraction of the complexes decomposes into the products arrangement and hence the LM hypothesis does not hold.

We can improve the LM using statistical model arguments. In complex mediated reactions, the statistical *ansatz*, $P_r^J(E) \approx P_{\rm capt}^J(E) \times P_{\to \rm prod}(E)$, can be applied, where $P_r^J(E)$ is the reaction probability of a given initial rovibrational state and total angular momentum, J (orbital, l, plus rotational, j), $P_{\rm capt}^J(E)$ the probability for the reagents to be captured in the complex, and $P_{\to \rm prod}(E)$ is the *statistical factor*: the probability of emerging into the product arrangement channel when the complex decomposes. If there is a complete randomization of the energy within the complex (ergodic hypothesis), the statistical factor will be independent of the initial state of the reagents, only subject to conservation of energy, J, and parity. Roughly speaking, the fraction of complexes which decompose into the reactants (D^++H_2) or products (H^++HD) is proportional to the respective number of scattering channels energetically available, denoted with $A(E)$ and $B(E)$ respectively, considering all of them as equiprobable. Accordingly, the statistical factor can be approximated by $P_{\to \rm prod}(E) = B(E)/[A(E) + B(E)]$ (number of favorable outcomes over the total number of equiprobable outcomes). At the considered energies, only three HD rovibrational states are open, as shown in Fig. 1, and for $J > 1$ we find that $A(E) = 1$ and $B(E) = 6$, and $P_{\to \rm prod} = 6/7$ ($\approx 86\,\%$) [48]. For $J = 0$ and $J = 1$ the statistical factors are 3/4 (75%) and 5/6($\approx$ 83%), respectively. If the collision energy is high enough for many partial waves to contribute, $P_{\to \rm prod}(E) \approx 6/7$, and $\sigma_{\rm r}(E) \approx P_{\to \rm prod} \cdot \sigma_{\rm L}(E)$. Therefore, 6/7 appears natu-



FIG. 2: Calculated reaction and elastic total cross-section for the collision D^++H_2 (v=0, j=0) compared with the Langevin prediction. The inset shows the comparison of the reaction cross-sections with the experimental data [29] and the result of the statistically corrected Langevin model.



FIG. 3: Reaction and elastic partial cross-sections at the indicated the $J(=l)$ values for the D^++H_2 (v=0, j=0) collision in the cold and ultracold regimes.

rally as a statistical factor to correct the LM expression. When the number of product channels is large enough, $B >> A$, then $P_{\to \rm prod} \approx 1$ and the result is $\sigma_{\rm L}(E)$. More accurate statistical implementations, which evaluate $A(E)$ and $B(E)$ as capture probabilities [24, 25], lead to similar conclusions.

The inset of Fig. 2, compares the calculated reaction cross-section with the experimental data from Ref. [29]. The corrected LM result is also shown and found in a very good agreement with both the experiment and the present calculations. The similarity of the theoretical results with the experiment is remarkable considering that the latter was performed with n-H_2. This is not coincidental: according to recent calculations in the high energy range (>100 K) [22], cross-section of j=0 and j=1 are similar.

The cross sections at much lower kinetic energies are also shown in Fig. 2. In the zero energy limit Wigner threshold laws [31, 41] state that the elastic and the total-loss (inelastic + reaction) cross-sections associated to each partial wave, l, vary $\sim E^{2l}$ and $\sim E^{l-1/2}$, respectively. However, for a potential with $n = 4$, the threshold law for elastic scattering becomes $\sim E$ for any $l > 0$ [31, 41, 42]. The ultracold cross-sections, shown in Fig. 3 for the four lowest partial waves, comply with these laws (there are no open inelastic channels). The limiting behaviors for l =0 are reflected in the total reaction ($\sim E^{-1/2}$) and total elastic (constant) cross-sections in the lowest energy region of Fig. 2, where only s-wave is open.

For $n = 4$ the energy dependence of the LM coincides with the Wigner threshold law ($\sim E^{-1/2}$). Remarkably, the absolute values of accurate and LM cross sections in the ultracold limit are nearly the same, $\sigma_{\rm r} \approx 1.07 \cdot \sigma_{\rm L}(E)$, as can be seen in Fig. 2. Therefore, the reaction rate coefficient (not shown) is practically constant in no less than eight orders of magnitude, and small variations can be further smoothed out with the Boltzmann averaging. In what follows, we will try to rationalize this classical Langevin behavior in the ultracold regime.

Very recently, quantal versions of the LM have been proposed [14, 43] under the assumption that all the flux that reaches the SR region leads to reaction. This situation is expected when the number of states coupled to the incident one is so large that all the incoming flux is irreversibly lost [14, 43]. In the n =4 case, these *universal* models conclude that the zero energy limit of $\sigma_{\rm r}$ is given by $2\sigma_{\rm L}(E)$, and not by $\sigma_{\rm L}(E)$ as we have approximately obtained. Therefore our system is not universal. The formalism in Ref. [9] is able to deal with systems where the *short range reaction probability* (SRRP), $P^{\rm re}$, is < 1. It provides expressions for the complex (energy dependent) scattering length, $\tilde{a}_l(k) = \alpha_l(k) - i\beta_l(k)$ in terms of the MQDT functions (where k is the relative wave number). This allows to parametrize $\tilde{a}_l(k)$ using two real parameters, y and s, together with the mean scattering length [35], $\bar{a} = (2\mu C_4)^{1/2}/\hbar$ (≈99.7 a_0 in this case). Specifically, the dimensionless parameter $0 \le y \le 1$ characterizes the flux that is lost from the incoming channel at SR, according to $P^{\rm re} = 4y/(1+y)^2$. The Langevin assumption or *universal case* corresponds to $y = 1$. The dimensionless scattering length $s = a/\bar{a}$ is related to an entrance channel phase, where a is the s-wave scattering length corresponding to the reference one-channel potential [9, 14]. The limits $s \to \pm\infty$ correspond to a bound state crossing threshold.

In terms of these parameters, the small k behavior of the real and imaginary parts of the complex scattering length for the lowest partial waves (l=0-3) are given by [49]:

$$\alpha_0(k) \to \bar{a}\frac{s(1-y^2)}{1+s^2y^2}, \qquad \beta_0(k) \to \frac{y(1+s^2)\,\bar{a}}{1+s^2y^2} \tag{1}$$

$$\alpha_1(k) \to -k\bar{a}^2\frac{\pi}{15}, \qquad \beta_1(k) \to \frac{y(1+s^2)\,k^2\bar{a}^3}{9(s^2+y^2)} \tag{2}$$

$$\alpha_2(k) \to -k\bar{a}^2\frac{\pi}{105}, \quad \beta_2(k) \to \frac{y(1+s^2)\,k^4\bar{a}^5}{2025(1+s^2y^2)} \tag{3}$$



FIG. 4: Real and imaginary parts of the scattering length, $\tilde{a}_l(k) = \alpha_l(k) - i\beta_l(k)$, obtained in the calculations for the 4 lowest partial waves. The absolute value of α, mostly negative, is plotted. The values for J =1, 2 and 3 (in continuous line) are compared with the predictions from the model in Ref. [9] (in dashed lines), calculated using Eqs. (2)-(4), assuming for s and y the same values that have been obtained for $J = 0$.

$$\alpha_3(k) \to -k\bar{a}^2\frac{\pi}{315}, \quad \beta_3(k) \to \frac{y(1+s^2)\,k^6\bar{a}^7}{2480625(s^2+y^2)} \qquad (4)$$

Our calculations yield the S-matrix as a function of the energy for each total angular momentum J and hence l (for j=0), what allows to calculate directly $\tilde{a}_l(k)$ using the elastic element of the S-matrix [44]:

$$\tilde{a}_l(k) = \frac{1}{ik}\,\frac{1 - S_{l,l}(k)}{1 + S_{l,l}(k)} \qquad (5)$$

Fig. 4 depicts the energy dependence of α and β for $J = 0 - 3$. The limiting behaviors are in perfect agreement with the threshold laws and the power of the dependence on k in Eqns. (1)-(4).

In order to extract the model parameters s and y from the calculated results, let us consider first the case $l = 0$. Using the values α_0 and β_0 at the lowest energy given by our calculations and solving Eqs. (1) for y and s, we obtain $y(l = 0) = 0.34$ and $s(l = 0) = -0.8$, which leads to a SRRP $P^{\rm re}(l = 0) = 77\%$. The parametrization for higher values of l is not straightforward. The real part of the scattering length, $\alpha_l(k)$, is independent on $s(l)$ and $y(l)$, and with the sole expression of $\beta_l(k)$ it is not possible to solve for the values of the two parameters.

Analogously to the procedure of Ref. 9, assuming that y and s do not depend on l, we can introduce $y(l = 0)$ and $s(l = 0)$ in Eqs. (2)–(4) and compare the resulting values of β_l with those obtained in the scattering calculations. The ratios of the calculated and parametrized values of β_l are 0.4, 1.4, and 0.7 for $l = 1$, $l = 2$ and l=3, respectively. The agreement can be considered good on average, taken into account the oscillations of this ratio about 1. In the Ar-He(^{3}S) system [5], where this approximation was used, [9] the reduced mass is four times bigger, what increases the number of partial waves probably reducing the average error. As for the the real parts of the scattering lengths, α_l, given by Eqs. (2)–(4), they can be directly compared with our scattering results. The agreement (within 1%) is very good what can be deemed as a test of the theory and serves to ensure the convergence of the scattering calculations. These expressions depend only on $\bar{a}$ (not on s or y) and they can be considered as really universal.

Only when SR forces act, at distances small enough as compared to the characteristic length of the potential, R_4, the dependence of the quantum defect parameter with energy and partial wave is expected to be negligible [9]. In the title system, $R_4 = \bar{a} \approx 100$ a$_0$ is not very large, leaving open the possibility of non constant parameters. However, we have checked that the $\sim R^{-4}$ behavior is valid in the region where the centrifugal barriers of the three considered partial waves are located. Furthermore, we can show that the dependence of $P^{\rm re}$ with E and l is weak. In Ref. [9], the expression $\sigma_{\rm r}(E) \approx P^{\rm re}\cdot\sigma_{\rm L}(E)$ is proposed when many partial waves are open. It connects the behavior at high energies with the value of $P^{\rm re}$ in the ultracold regime, assuming that y is essentially constant. The fact that $\sigma_{\rm r}(E)/\sigma_{\rm L}(E)$ has an average value of 0.78 in the range 1-150 K, very close to the $P^{\rm re}(l = 0)$ obtained at ultracold energies, indicates a weak dependence of $P^{\rm re}$ with l and energy. An accurate determination of $y(E, l)$ and $s(E, l)$ would require an implementation of the MQDT fitting functions, which is out of the scope of this work.

For $J = 0$ only 3 open channels are coupled to the incident one, what justifies a significant portion of flux returning to the incident channel from the complex, and thus $P^{\rm re} < 1$. Moreover, its value should reflect the statistical balance between the reacting and returning fluxes which results from the loss of memory at the well. We can expect that $P^{\rm re}$, the fraction of captured flux which reacts, is related with $P_{\to{\rm prod}}$, the fraction of formed complexes which decompose to give the products. Furthermore, the expression $\sigma_{\rm r}(E) \approx P^{\rm re}\cdot\sigma_{\rm L}(E)$, from Ref. 9, has the same structure as $\sigma_{\rm r}(E) \approx P_{\to{\rm prod}}\cdot\sigma_{\rm L}(E)$, obtained from the statistical hypothesis. This establishes an *equivalence* between $P^{\rm re}$ and $P_{\to{\rm prod}}$ in the Langevin regime. In fact, the average value of $\sigma_{\rm r}(E)/\sigma_{\rm L}(E)$, 78%, agrees within 10% with the statistical factor 6/7 (≈86%) at energies $>$ 100 K. This reinforces the use of statistical models for complex–mediated systems to estimate $P^{\rm re}$, and thus the y parameter: as long as the expression $\sigma_{\rm r}(E) \approx P^{\rm re}\cdot\sigma_{\rm L}(E)$ is applicable, the $P^{\rm re}$ at threshold can be estimated by calculations of $\sigma_{\rm r}(E)/\sigma_{\rm L}(E)$ at much higher energies (about 100 K in our case), where an extreme accuracy of the PES is not required and the statistical model has proven semiquantitative[28]. Other common dynamical methodologies (classical and quantum) could be used to calculate $\sigma_{\rm r}(E)/\sigma_{\rm L}(E)$ and to extract y in non-statistical systems.

In recent times, statistical methods are being revisited in the field of cold collisions [45, 46]. However, some caveats are in order if applying the statistical ansatz in the ultracold regime. If we consider the expression of $\beta_0(k)$ in Eq. (1), we can write:

$$P_{\rm r}^{J=0}(E) = 4k\beta_0(k) = 4k\bar{a} \times \frac{y(1+s^2)}{1+s^2y^2} \qquad (6)$$

By comparison with the statistical factorization, $P_{\rm r}^{J}(E) \approx P_{\rm capt}^{J}(E) \times P_{\rightarrow \rm prod}(E)$, the first factor, which is the zero-energy limit of the l=0 one-channel capture probability [10], can be identified with $P_{\rm capt}^{J}(E)$. Hence, the second term should be related to $P_{\rightarrow \rm prod}(E)$. However, this term can be greater than one for big values of s, [14] and cannot be deemed as a probability. As s is related to a phase, and a lack of correlation between capture and decay of the complex is implicit in the statistical model, the validity of the ansatz is into question when approaching threshold. Furthermore, as the energy decreases, $A(E)$, which strictly speaking is a capture probability, will vanish while $B(E)$ remains essentially constant. This leads to $P_{\rightarrow \rm prod}(E) = 1$ and thus $P_{\rm r}^{J=0}(E) = 4k\bar{a}$: *the zero energy limit of the statistical ansatz is the universal case*, at least considering one-channel captures. It is an open question how this limitations may affect implementations of the statistical method which consider multi-channel (*vs.* one-channel) capture probabilities [24].

In summary, accurate scattering calculations have allowed us to test the quantum theory by Jachymsky *et al.* [9, 14, 15]. The model is able to account for the main features of the dynamics under the assumption of parameters independent on l and E. On average, the same $P^{\rm re}$ describes the ultracold and the Langevin regimes. We have found a link between $P^{\rm re}$ and the statistical factor of the statistical approach to reactions [24]. Apart from physical insight, this provides a way to calculate y, which characterizes the ultracold regime, using common methodology in reaction dynamics at much higher energies. Finally, in the light of the model, limitations of the statistical ansatz to describe ultracold collisions are discussed. Our work contributes to fill the gap between the field of ultracold atomic physics and that of quantum reaction dynamics.

The authors are greatly indebted to K. Jachymski, Andrea Simoni and T. González-Lezana for fruitful discussions and exchange of information. The Spanish Ministries of Science and Innovation and Economy and Competitiveness (grants CTQ2008-02578/BQU, CSD2009-00038, and CTQ2012-37404-C02) are gratefully acknowledged.

[1] S. Ospelkaus, K.-K. Ni, D. Wang, M. H. G. de Miranda, B. Neyenhuis, G. Quéméner, P. S. Julienne, J. L. Bohn, D. S. Jin, and J. Ye, Science **327**, 853 (2010).
[2] P. Staanum, S. D. Kraft, J. Lange, R. Wester, and M. Weidemüller, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 023201 (2006).
[3] N. Zahzam, T. Vogt, M. Mudrich, D. Comparat, and P. Pillet, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 023202 (2006).
[4] E. R. Hudson, N. B. Gilfoy, S. Kotochigova, J. M. Sage, and D. DeMille, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 203201 (2008).
[5] A. B. Henson, S. Gersten, Y. Shagam, J. Narevicius, and E. Narevicius, Science **338**, 234 (2012).
[6] S. Willitsch, M. T. Bell, A. D. Gingell, and T. P. Softley, Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys **10**, 7200 (2008).
[7] F. H. J. Hall and S. Willitsch, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 233202 (2012).
[8] S. Willitsch, M. T. Bell, A. D. Gingell, S. R. Procter, and T. P. Softley, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 043203 (2008).
[9] K. Jachymski, M. Krych, P. S. Julienne, and Z. Idziaszek, Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 213202 (2013).
[10] P. Julienne, Faraday Discuss. **142**, 361 (2009).
[11] S. Kotochigova, New Journal of Physics **12**, 073041 (2010).
[12] B. Gao, Phys. Rev. A **78**, 012702 (2008).
[13] G. Quéméner and J. L. Bohn, Phys. Rev. A **81**, 022702 (2010).
[14] Z. Idziaszek and P. S. Julienne, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 113202 (2010).
[15] K. Jachymski, M. Krych, P. S. Julienne, and Z. Idziaszek (2014), arXiv:1407.8030.
[16] J. Jankunas, B. Bertsche, K. Jachymski, M. Hapka, and A. Osterwalder, J. Chem. Phys. **140**, 244302 (2014).
[17] E. Lavert-Ofir, Y. Shagan, A. B. Henson, S. Gersten, J. Klos, P. Zuchowski, J. Narevivius, and E. Narevicius, Nat. Chem. **6**, 332 (2014).
[18] J. M. Launay and M. L. Dourneuf, Chem. Phys. Lett **169**, 473 (1990).
[19] B. J. McCall, T. R. Geballe, K. H. Hinkle, and T. Oka, Astrophys J. **522**, 338 (1999).
[20] E. Carmona-Novillo, T. González-Lezana, O. Roncero, P. Honvault, J.-M. Launay, N. Bulut, F. J. Aoiz, L. Bañares, A. Trottier, and E. Wrede, J. Chem. Phys. **128**, 014304 (2008).
[21] P. G. Jambrina, J. M. Alvariño, F. J. Aoiz, V. J. Herrero, and V. Sáez Rábanos, Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys. **12**, 12591 (2010).
[22] P. Honvault and Y. Scribano, J. Phys. Chem. A **117**, 9778 (2013).
[23] P. Honvault and Y. Scribano, J. Phys. Chem. A **117**, 13205 (2013).
[24] E. J. Rackham, F. Huarte-Larranaga, and D. E. Manolopoulos, Chem. Phys. Lett. **343**, 356 (2001).
[25] F. J. Aoiz, T. González-Lezana, and V. Sáez–Rábanos, J. Chem. Phys. **127**, 174109 (2007).
[26] T. González-Lenzana, P. Honvault, P. G. Jambrina, F. J. Aoiz, and J.-M. Launay, J. Chem. Phys. **131**, 044315 (2009).
[27] T. González-Lezana, P. Honvault, and Y. Scribano, J. Chem. Phys. **139**, 054301 (2013).
[28] T. González-Lezana, Y. Scribano, and P. Honvault, J. Phys. Chem. A **118**, 6416 (2014).

[29] D. Gerlich, Adv. Chem. Phys. **82**, 1 (1992).

[30] D. Gerlich, R. P. sil, I. Zymak, M. Hejduk, P. Jusko, D. Mulin, and J. Glosík, J. Phys. Chem. A **117**, 10068 (2013).

[31] H. R. Sadeghpour, J. L. Bohn, M. J. Cavagnero, B. D. Esry, I. I. Fabrikant, J. H. Macek, and A. R. P. Rau, J. Phys. B: At. Mol. Opt. Phys. **33** (2000).

[32] M. Przybytek and B. Jeziorski, J. Chem. Phys. **123**, 134315 (2005).

[33] W. Vassen, C. Cohen-Tannoudji, M. Leduc, D. Boiron, C. I. Westbrook, A. Truscott, K. Baldwin, G. Birkl, P. Cancio, and M. Trippenbach, Rev. Mod. Phys. **84**, 175 (2012).

[34] S. Knoop, P. S. Zuchowski, D. Kedziera, A. Mentel, M. Puchalski, H. P. Mishra, A. S. Flores, and W. Vassen (2014), arXiv:1404.4826.

[35] G. F. Gribakin and V. V. Flambaum, Phys. Rev. A **48**, 546 (1993).

[36] L. Velilla, B. Lepetit, A. Aguado, J. A. Beswick, and M. Paniagua, J. Chem. Phys. **129**, 084307 (2008).

[37] P. Honvault and J.-M. L. Dynamics, *in Theory of Chemical Reaction Dynamics* (NATO Science Series vol. 145, Kluwer, 2004).

[38] P. Soldán, M. T. Cvitaš, J. M. Hutson, P. Honvault, and J.-M. Launay, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 153201 (2002).

[39] M. Lara, F. Dayou, and J.-M. Launay, Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys **13**, 8359 (2011).

[40] M. Lara, J. L. Bohn, D. E. Potter, P. Soldán, and J. M. Hutson, Phys. Rev. A **75**, 012704 (2007).

[41] J. Weiner, V. S. Bagnato, S. Zilio, and P. S. Julienne, Rev. Mod. Phys. **71**, 1 (1999).

[42] Z. Idziaszek, A. Simoni, T. Calarco, and P. S. Julienne, New J. Phys. **13**, 083005 (2011).

[43] B. Gao, Phys. Rev. A **83**, 062712 (2011).

[44] J. M. Hutson, New J. Phys. **9**, 152 (2007).

[45] M. Mayle, G. Quéméner, B. P. Ruzic, and J. L. Bohn, Phys. Rev. A **87**, 012709 (2013).

[46] M. L. González-Martínez and O. Dulieu (2014), arXiv:1407.4502.

[47] The integral $\langle j = 0|P_2|j = 0\rangle$ is null, and the contributions from $\sim R^{-3}$ and anisotropic polarization terms vanish. [36]

[48] As an example, for $J = 2$ the incoming channel has quantum numbers (v=0, j=0, l=2, J=2). Only those product channels, (v', j', l', J), with the same total angular momentum $J = 2$, and parity $\epsilon = (-1)^{j+l} = +1$, are coupled to the incoming one. Considering all the possible combinations, we get that $A(E) = 1$ and $B(E) = 6$.

[49] Equations (1) and (2) were kindly provided by the authors of Ref. 9; Eq. (3) and Eq. (4) were deduced by the authors of this work following Refs. 9 and 42.